

WASHINGTON POST

mdu  
G  
f/c

# Spy Trial Jurors Ask Clarifications

By Jane Seaberry  
Washington Post Staff Writer

The jury in the Vietnamese espionage trial in Alexandria interrupted its deliberations yesterday to ask the judge if Ronald Humphrey would have to know that David Truong was a Vietnamese agent in order to aid and abet Truong in any alleged espionage plot.

Humphrey is the United States Information Agency employee who is accused of stealing cables and giving them to Truong in what Humphrey said was an effort to improve relations with Vietnam and get his common-law wife out of that country.

Truong, a Vietnamese expatriate whose father once was a peace candidate against Nguyen Van Thieu, is accused of passing the cables through a courier—who testified she was a government agent—to Communist officials in Paris.

Judge Albert V. Bryan answered "yes" to the jury's question, which came during the first day of deliberations in the case.

The jury recessed at 7:30 last night and planned to resume deliberations

today on the charges that Humphrey and Truong committed espionage, conspiracy and other crimes on behalf of Vietnam.

Midway through deliberations yesterday jury foreman Robert Charlesworth, a retired executive of the American Telephone and Telegraph Co. sent Bryan a note requesting clarification of four of the jury instructions they received yesterday.

In addition to the "aiding and abetting" question the jurors asked Bryan to define the terms "agent" and "representative" that are used in the indictment. A person who acts on behalf of a government with its authority is an agent, Bryan said. An agent and a representative of a foreign government are the same, he said.

Jurors also asked whether the judge's instructions given to the jury yesterday morning meant that the government had to show both an intent to injure the United States and aid a foreign nation on the part of Humphrey and Truong. Bryan said only one of the conditions had to be met.

In another question the jurors asked for a definition of "national defense." Humphrey and Truong are accused of attempting to injure the national defense. Bryan defined "national defense" as concerning military and naval operations and other activities related to the national defense.

The relationship must be direct and not strained, Bryan said. It is up to the jury to determine whether the documents allegedly passed to the Communists by Humphrey and Truong relate to the national defense.

Earlier yesterday one of Truong's attorneys, Marvin D. Miller, filed papers in court requesting that the government pay for two cocktails or drinks per juror at the end of each day of deliberations.

The reason for the request, he said, was that the juror "ought to be permitted to live as comfortable as possible during the course of their deliberations . . . The Volstead Act has been repealed and . . . Virginia is no longer a dry state."